

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application.

Information Disclosure Statement

A copy of EP 0877518 is enclosed as requested by the Examiner. Please consider this reference and send Applicant the initialed PTO-1449 form indicating that this has been done.

Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brown et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,661) in view of *Breton* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0035471) and *Cheng et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0009341). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Brown, *Breton* and *Cheng*, even if they can be properly combined, fail to teach, disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitation of claim 1, in particular, "recognizing patterns so as to search, on the basis of a syntax formed of a set of phrases which represent the set of possible paths between a set of words prerecorded during a prior phase, for a phrase of said syntax that is the closest to said signal in its compressed form."

Brown discloses a method for recognizing an input identifier by comparing the recognized identifier with a set of reference identifier maintained in memory. However, the method disclosed by *Brown* can only compare the recognized identifier with a limited number of reference identifiers, these reference identifiers are defined as a character string that can only include letters and/or figures. More specifically, for each character, the possible amount of identifiers cannot exceed ten figures, or thirty alphabetical characters.

For a character string exceeding six characters, there are some tens of million possible combinations, number of combinations that it is possible to reduce strongly by

means of known algorithms.

Therefore, the problem solved by the invention of claim 1 is not only recognizing characters but to recognize words. Indeed, even with a reduced vocabulary, for example: 300 words (See, for example, page 3 of the present application), and even with short sentences, the amount of possible sentences that match the identifiers is huge and cannot be reduced to an exploitable amount of combinations pre-recorded as described in *Brown*. Consequently, the method described in *Brown* would not be properly applied to sentences recognizing.

It is necessary to use syntax to keep only the combinations, paths or possible transitions between the various words that constitute a sense. Thus, as described in page 3 of the present application, after the step of syntax, 300 words form no more than 400,000 possible sentences. That is relatively less selections and more practical as compared with the total amount of the possible combinations. Therefore, *Brown* fails to disclose at least all of limitations included in independent claim 1.

Breton or *Cheng* both fail to overcome the deficiency of *Brown*. Nowhere does *Breton* or *Cheng* teach, disclose or suggest using a syntax to reduce the number of possible combinations.

Accordingly, the invention recited in claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of *Brown et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,661) and *Cheng et al.* and therefore the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 7-9 and 13-14 recite additional, important limitations and should be patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection of Claims 2-3, 7-9 and 13-14 should be withdrawn.

Claims 4-6, 10-12 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brown et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,661) in view of *Breton* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0035471) and *Cheng et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0009341), as applied to claims 1, 2 and 3, and further in view of *Stevens et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0138265). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons as below.

Claims 4-6, 10-12 and 15-16 are directly or in directly dependent on claim 1. Thus, claims 4-6, 10-12 and 15-16 are patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 as well as on their own merits. Accordingly, the obviousness rejection of Claims 4-6, 10-12 and 15-16 should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: April 22, 2008
KMB/SY/ser